DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 089 914 RC 007 830

AUTHOR	Dunkelberger, John E., Ed.; Vanlandingham, Janice B., Ed.
TITLE	Reflections on the Development of Cooperative Rural Sociology Research in the South. Rural Sociology Series No. 1, April 1974.
INSTITUTION	Auburn Univ., Ala. Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	RS-Ser-1
PUB DATE	Apr 74
NOTE	63p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Agriculture; Community Development; Cooperative Planning; Federal Aid; *History; *Living Standards; Mobility; Problems; Research; *Rural Areas; *Rural Economics; *Sociology
IDENTIFIERS	*South

ABSTRACT

A historical overview of events through which regional research has evolved among rural sociologists in the South is presented in this report. The report is divided into 3 sections. The first section, an introduction, contains 2 articles. The first discusses the general climate of rural sociology activity during the first half of the 20th century. The second is an example of a specific early effort at regional research cooperation. Section 2 focuses specifically on the history of cooperative regional research among southern rural sociologists. A view of the future is presented in section 3, which provides some ideas about the potentials and problems of rural sociology in the South both as a discipline and as an effective research structure capable of providing the knowledge required to effectively cope with the problems of rural peoples and institutions. Appendices for the different sections present additional information. (PS)

ED 089914

Rural Sociology Series No. 1

April 1974

REFLECTIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATIVE RURAL SOCIOLOGY RESEARCH IN THE SOUTH

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Under the Sponsorship of

The Southern Rural Sociology Research Committee

Farm Foundation

EDITORS

John E. Dunkelberger

Janice B. Vanlandingham

Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology
Agricultural Experiment Station, Auburn University
Auburn, Alabama

R. Dennis Rouse,
Director

RC007830

PREFACE

In 1972, a Cooperative Structures Subcommittee was formed within the Southern Rural Sociology Research Committee for the purpose of assessing and promoting regional cooperation among rural sociologists and others interested in the problems of rural areas in the South. One objective of this subcommittee was to compile a historical overview charting the course of events through which regional research had evolved among rural sociologists in the region. This report is an effort to provide such a history. Although it is by no means exhaustive of the cooperative research efforts by southern rural sociologists, it reflects some of the major events which have culminated in a viable research program of a regional nature.

The report is divided into three sections. The first, an introduction, contains two articles. Since one cannot assess the growth of the discipline in the South unless one understands the context of its development nationally, the report begins with a synopsis of T. Lynn Smith's history of rural sociology in the United States. It discusses the general climate of rural sociology activity during the first half of the 20th century. A second article, by Alvin Bertrand, is included here as an example of a specific, early effort at regional research cooperation in which rural sociologists participated. Section two, which focuses specifically on the history of the cooperative regional research among southern rural sociologists, includes three articles. The first, by E. V. Smith, reflects on the circumstances leading to and the problems associated with the development of regional research by the southern rural sociologists as viewed from the perspective of an Agricultural Experiment Station administrator. Two men who have been personally involved in the development of the regional research effort among rural sociologists in the South provide the historical facts about the organization and progress of regional research cooperation in their articles. Harold Kaufman and Charles Cleland trace this history through the decades of the fifties and sixties, respectively. Since no undertaking of this sort is complete without a view to the future, we have included such a statement by William Kuvlesky in Section three. He provides some of his ideas about the potentials and problems of rural sociology in the South both as a discipline and as an effective research structure capable of providing the knowledge required to effectively cope with the problems of rural peoples and institutions.

Although editing may have altered the structure of the accounts presented, it was not meant to alter the personal descriptions and interpretations provided by the respective authors. We the editors, are indebted to the authors for accepting the task given each of them. The accounts presented here represent a necessary perspective for assessing where rural sociology as a discipline has come from and where it may be

going. If the discipline is to recruit and train new talent for continuing the research cooperation described in these articles, then it is important that the new initiates become aware of that which has gone before. It is to this end that this publication is dedicated.

The editors wish to acknowledge the assistance of A. Lee Coleman, University of Kentucky and Alvin L. Bertrand of Louisiana State University, for their contribution in reviewing these articles. Their comments were invaluable to us. Appreciation is also extended to the Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology for providing the facilities needed to make this publication possible. Our thanks are especially extended to Ms. Lucy Noordermeer for typing the manuscript.

REFLECTIONS ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF COOPERATIVE RURAL SOCIOLOGY RESEARCH IN THE SOUTH

Table of Contents

	Page
Preface	i
Section I - Introduction	1
The Development of Rural Sociology in the United States, with a few Annotations on Its Development in the South . . . . . T. Lynn Smith	3
A Short History of the Southwestern Land Tenure Research Committee . . . . . A. L. Bertrand	19
Section II - History	23
Origin and Development of Regional Rural Sociological Research in the South . . E. V. Smith	25
Cooperative Research Efforts Among Rural Sociologists in the South During the Fifties . . . . . Harold F. Kaufman	29
Southern Regional Research in Rural Sociology During the Sixties . . . . Charles L. Cleland	41
Section III - Future	59
The Future for Rural Sociology Research in the South . . . . . William P. Kuvlesky	61

Section I

INTRODUCTION

THE DEVELOPMENT OF RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES, WITH A FEW ANNOTATIONS ON ITS DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOUTH*

T. Lynn Smith**

In addition to his own files and recollections, anyone attempting to review the origin, growth, and development of the scientific study of rural society in the South or in the United States in general has three major endeavors to depict the history of this science on which he may draw. In chronological order these are The Growth of a Science: A Half-Century of Rural Sociological Research in the United States by Edmund de S. Brunner (1957),[1] Rural Sociology: A Trend Report and Bibliography--Sociologie Rurale: Tendances actuelles de la recherche et bibliographie by T. Lynn Smith (also 1957),[2] and Rural Sociology: Its Origin and Growth in the United States by Lowry Nelson (1969).[3] For rather obvious reasons I draw heavily on the second of these. In fact, for the general theme I follow its paragraphs very closely, since at the time I prepared it at the request of the International Sociological Association I made every effort to discover and weigh as judiciously as possible the events and happenings that mattered most in the development of our discipline.

The Background

Rural sociology was an important and integral part of the whole when in the last two decades of the nineteenth century - courses in sociology appeared almost simultaneously - in scores of American colleges and universities. This was particularly true at the University of Chicago, where George E. Vincent and Charles R. Henderson laid much of the groundwork which led in 1892 to the organization of the department of sociology, and at Columbia University where Franklin H. Giddings,

---

*This is an abbreviated version of a paper presented to the Section on Rural Sociology at the Meeting of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Jacksonville, Florida, February 1-3, 1971. The full Text of it has appeared as an article in the International Review of Sociology, II Series, Vol. VIII, No. 1 (April, 1972), pp. 60-90.

**Graduate Research Professor of Sociology, University of Florida, Gainesville.

from his chair in the Faculty of Political Science, began interesting graduate students in the sociological study of rural communities.*

In considerable measure, though, the development of rural sociology, and perhaps of general sociology as well, arose out of the humanitarian philosophy which was a highly potent force in the United States during the closing decades of the nineteenth century. With the exhaustion of the supply of unoccupied new land, the passing of the frontier, and the growing pains of an industrial civilization, there arose an acute awareness that all was not well in the United States and particularly in rural America. The decline of the open country church and the depopulation (or "folk depletion" in the terminology of Edward Alsworth Ross) of the rural portions of New England and other parts of the Northeast were among the trends of greatest importance in stimulating a humanitarian interest in rural life. In any case, such an interest -- one characterized by sympathy and pity, on the one hand, and a burning desire to do something to improve life in the country, on the other -- had become widespread by about 1900. It was especially strong among the clergymen of the time, although I find no evidence that southern ministers were prominent in the movement. An immediate effect of attitudes and activities of these clergymen was the establishment of courses on Rural Social Problems at the University of Chicago, the University of Michigan, Michigan State College, and the University of North Dakota. To the clergy men and other humanists of the time also must be credited the creation of the atmosphere that led President Theodore Roosevelt to appoint his famous Commission on Country Life. The hearings conducted, the meetings promoted, and the Report published by the Commission and the activities they produced were responsible in large measure for the development of rural sociological research and teaching in the United States.

---

*Vincent's role seems to have been entirely overlooked by those, with the exception of Lowry Nelson, who have written on the development of rural sociology, perhaps because his writing in the field was cut short by his rapid advancement to the presidency of the University of Minnesota and then to that of the Rockefeller Foundation. Nevertheless, we can be certain that he was responsible for the prominence with which the study of rural social phenomena figures in An Introduction to the Study of Society, the first textbook in sociology to be published in the United States. Later on, when he was elected as president of the American Sociological Society (1916) he organized the Annual Meetings of the professional organization around the theme, "The Sociology of Rural Life", and took as the topic for his presidential address "Countryside and Nation". In 1917, too, when president of the Rockefeller Foundation, he was one of a group of nine leaders who made themselves into "The Committee on Country Life" which was responsible for the organization of the American Country Life Association. Among other things, when he was President of the University of Minnesota he wrote the "Introduction" to the first rural sociology textbook, Gillett's, Constructive Rural Sociology.

The Commission itself was appointed in 1908. The occasion was a visit to this country, and a call upon the President, by the noted Irish author and reformer Sir Horace Plunkett. Roosevelt was quick to see the need and swift to grasp the opportunity. In fact, his enthusiasm led him to propose to Congress that the "Department of Agriculture... should become in fact a Department of Country Life"! Roosevelt prevailed upon the noted naturalist, Professor Liberty Hyde Bailey of Cornell University, to head the Commission, and Henry Wallace, Kenyon L. Butterfield, Gifford Pinchot, Walter H. Page of North Carolina (editor of The World's Work), Charles S. Barrett (of Georgia), and William A. Beard to serve as members. Of the group, Butterfield, then President of the University of Massachusetts, definitely deserved to be classified as a rural sociolist. In his letter of appointment the President stressed: "Agriculture is not the whole of country life. The great rural interests are human interests, and good crops are of little value to the farmer unless they open the door to a good kind of life on the farm".

The famous Report of the Country Life Commission, first published in 1909, sounded a call for better living on the farms and recommended three measures for promoting the desired objective: (1) "taking stock of country life... an exhaustive study or survey of all the conditions that surround the business of farming and the people who live in the country"; (2) nationalized extension work; and (3) "a campaign for rural progress. We urge the holding of local, state and even national conferences on rural progress, designed to unite the interests of education, organization and religion into one forward movement for the rebuilding of country life". The nationalizing of agricultural extension work was the expansion over the entire country of work begun in the South by Seaman A. Knapp, a transplanted midwesterner living and working in Southwestern Louisiana.[4]

In line with these recommendations, the next decade was one of great ferment, intense activity, a tremendous threshing about more or less aimlessly on the part of hundreds of group and associations whose members were motivated by a burning desire to bring about a genuine improvement in the rural life of the nation. Many of the first steps in the development of rural sociology as a discipline were taken prior to 1920, but in general the years between 1909 and 1920 must be thought of as the period of the general social survey. In an attempt to follow through on the recommendations of the Commission on Country Life, during these years hundreds of rural life conferences were held throughout the nation and rural social surveys were attempted. In the survey movement Warren H. Wilson, a Ph.D. in sociology under Giddings at Columbia, was largely responsible, as director of Town and Country Surveys for the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., for the conduct and publication between 1912 and 1916 of 16 "Church and Community Surveys" covering 17 counties in 12 different states.[5] Charles Otis Gill, a clergyman of the Congregational Church, and his renowned cousin, Gifford Pinchot, made detailed studies of every church in two counties and wrote The Country Church: Decline of Influence and Remedy[6], to report their results.

The activities of Wilson and Gill, accompanied by numerous less well oriented endeavors on the part of ministers in various other denominations, eventually led to the formidable under takings on the part of the survey department of the Town and Country Division of the Interchurch World Movement. In the years immediately following the close of the first world war, this organization undertook a study of rural life in the United States on a scale unparalleled before or since. As H. N. Morse and Edmund de S. Brunner have recounted the facts, in the "Introduction" to their The Town and Country Church in the United States, the survey was organized in every state in the Union, where it was in charge of a paid, full-time director. "About three-fourths of these supervisors were clergymen, all of whom had been country ministers at one time or another... The rest... were laymen who were, almost without exception, professors of rural sociology or economics at educational institutions...". The first duty of each state director was to organize his state, that is to secure young ministers to become directors of the survey in each county and to get others to serve as assistants. Nearly 8,000 persons, of whom over 1,000 were laymen, contributed their time. When the Interchurch World Movement collapsed, the survey was operating in over 2,400 counties. The salvaging of some of the results of this endeavor was one of the big accomplishments of the Institute of Social and Religious Research which was organized in 1921.

The Country Life Movement and the American Country Life Association are other items to be reckoned with in giving the background out of which rural sociology developed. In the early stages the entire set of surveys and rural life conferences came to be known as the Country Life Movement. However, the rise of the Conservation Movement, also largely due to the stimulation by the Report of the Country Life Commission, offered an alternative into which much of the energy was channelled; and the doctrine that the economic factor was all important, that if the farm family had an adequate income all other rural problems would take care of themselves, also entrapped many of those interested in rural betterment. But most of the leaders were not entirely satisfied that either of these was a complete answer to the problem of adequate rural society in the United States. As a result, in 1917 a group of them met and organized themsleves into a Committee on Country Life. After a little more than a year of preparation this group called a meeting of the leaders in country-life work throughout the nation and organized the National (later the American) Country Life Association, a body that, especially during the decade 1920-30 was closely linked to the development of rural sociology.

Although the South and southerners figured to some extent in the ferment of discontent over the plight of the rural church and other dissatisfactions that arouse our of the growing pains of urbanization and industrialization of American society, which set the state for the rise of rural sociology, relatively little of the background of the new science was set against the background of southern society.

The Genesis of Rural Sociology

As indicated above, rural sociology was an important integral part of sociology in general when the new subject made its way into college and university curricula during the closing decades of the nineteenth century and the opening ones of the twentieth. Courses in rural sociology and rural social problems were among the first ways in which differentiation appeared in the offerings in sociology. The preparation of course outlines and reading lists laid the basis for what later became the first texts and other general works in the field. Prior to 1920, though, it is possible to single out several developments which can be considered as the first step in the development of a genuine rural sociological literature. The first of these was the completion of three doctoral dissertations at Columbia University by James M. Williams, Warren H. Wilson, and Newel L. Sims, respectively. These were all under the direction of Franklin H. Giddings and involved the study of specific rural communities. Another development was the election of George H. Vincent as president of the American Sociological Society, and as a consequence, the selection of "the Sociology of Rural Life" as the theme for the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Society held at Columbus, Ohio, Dec. 27-29, 1916. A third was the publication of the first rural sociology textbooks, John M. Gillette's Constructive Rural Sociology[8] in 1913 and Paul L. Vogt's Introduction to Rural Sociology[9] in 1917. Also deserving of mention are the facts that the first rural sociological paper to be presented before the American Sociological Society was one entitled "Rural Life and the Family", given by Kenyon L. Butterfield at the third annual meetings in 1908, and that in 1912 J. P. Lichtenberger of the University of Pennsylvania solicited and edited a set of papers for a special "Country Life" issue of the Annals.

But probably the most important step taken prior to 1920 was C. J. Galpin's study of The Social Anatomy of an Agricultural Community and its publication in 1915 as a Bulletin of the Wisconsin Agricultural Experiment Station. This study at once demonstrated that the American farmer was not a "man without a community", defined the rural community in definite and readily understandable terms, and described a method by which its limits could be delineated. Largely as a result of this research, Galpin was called to Washington in 1919, when his friend and superior at the University of Wisconsin, Dr. Henry C. Taylor, went to the U.S. Department of Agriculture to organize and head the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, to begin the work which led to the establishment of the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life.

A Decade of Progress, 1920-1929

The decade 1920-1929 was the one in which substantial form was given to the emerging field of rural sociology. The highlights of this development appear to be the following. Galpin from his position as Chief of the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life adopted the policy of using a major portion of his small budget for cooperation projects throughout the nation with sociologists who were interested in rural life. The University of Wisconsin and Cornell University appear to have been the chief beneficiaries of this policy, for most of the rural sociological bulletins published by their respective Agricultural Experiment Stations between 1920 and 1930 indicate that the studies were done in co-operation with his Division. However, sociologists at other state institutions, at private universities such as Tulane[10] and Brigham Young[11], and at least one college for Negroes[12], also received some assistance. The studies completed under these arrangements form a very substantial part of the publications up until about 1932. Also of importance was Galpin's demonstration of the need for and interest in data concerning the farm population of the United States, the step which led in 1930 to the use of the rural-farm category as a basic component of the tabulation of U. S. Population Census data.

The work of Edmund de S. Brunner during this decade is deserving of special mention. To begin with, Brunner was largely responsible for salvaging parts of the surveys undertaken by the Interchurch World Movement, and for organizing the supplementary work needed to make those materials of the most significance. Through the organization of the Institute of Social and Religious Research in New York City of which he became director, it was assured that his major efforts would be devoted to rural sociology, and he gained the organization needed to plan, finance, and conduct the original survey of 140 agricultural villages. As the decade closed he had already developed most of the plans for the 1930 resurvey of the same communities, which, combined with the second resurvey in 1936, completed the most comprehensive study of rural social change that has been done.[13]

At this point it seems well to note that the 1920's were years in which significant beginnings in Rural Sociology occurred in some of the states. At Louisiana State University, courses in Rural Sociology were being offered and by 1931, research in rural sociology was begun in the Agricultural Experiment Station. In North Carolina, both Carl C. Taylor and Carle C. Zimmerman were active.[14]

The passage of the Purnell Act by the U.S. Congress, a measure of paramount importance in the history of rural sociological research, came in 1925.

The provisions of the Purnell Act, through which each state received $50,000 annually for research purposes, made it possible for any director of an agricultural experiment station, who desired, to use substantial sums for the support of rural sociological research in his state. As a result, many of the stations have long maintained rural sociologists on their staffs and have developed substantial programs of research in the field.

The passage of the Purnell Act, however, did not immediately create a higher competency on the part of those already engaged in rural sociological research nor of those who took the new positions that were created. As was to be expected, not all of the endeavors of the workers in the stations introducing the work were crowned with success. In some states, at least, the development of rural sociology received a decided setback because projects were undertaken by insufficiently trained persons. It was at this juncture that the Social Science Research Council stepped in, in 1927, with a program of fellowships specifically designed to train rural sociologists and agricultural economists for the positions in the agricultural experiment stations. That this was one of the highly significant developments of the decade would seem to be indicated by the fact that a number of rural sociologists, many of whom lived and worked in the South, received part of their graduate training by virtue of these fellowships.

Finally, the decade 1920-1929 was the one in which efforts at synthesis in the field got under way in earnest. This difficult work began on a small scale in the preparation of Gillete's new book on Rural Sociology. It was advanced considerably when Taylor, then at North Carolina State University, published in 1926 the first edition of his Rural Sociology, and also added to by the appearance of the first edition of Sim's Elements of Rural Sociology in 1928. However, the culmination came in 1929 with the publication of The Principles of Rural-Urban Sociology by Sorokin and Zimmerman, followed within a few years by the appearance of the three volumes of the Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology by Sorokin, Zimmerman, and Galpin. The work of preparing these books brought to bear upon the field or rural sociology in a long concerted effort the ingenuity of Sorokin and his vast knowledge of European society and sociology, and Zimmerman's genius, determination, drive and mastery of developments on the American scene. Rarely have such extraordinarily able representatives of two such diverse currents of thought been brought together to work intensively side by side for a period of five or six years. The result was the finest synthesis of the field of rural sociology achieved to date.

The Period of Maturation, 1930-1945

The years 1930 to about 1945 may be characterized as the ones in which the discipline of Rural Sociology came of age. They also are ones in which the leadership and the quantity and quality of work in rural

sociology in the South did not suffer in comparison with those anywhere else in the nation. During the first few years of this period, the difficult work of synthesis was the outstanding feature. As indicated above, this was the time when the appearance of A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology by Sorokin and Zimmerman completed an epoch-making venture in this field. It was ably supplemented by the completion by Brunner and associates of 140 agricultural villages and the expansion of the study by Brunner and John H. Kolb into Rural Social Trendes (1933).[15] In this form the study was one of the monographs prepared as a basis for the report of the Committee on Recent Social Trends appointed by President Herbert Hoover. A considerably revised edition of Taylor's Rural Sociology appeared the same year. Then followed a lapse of seven years, during which an expanding corps of rural sociologists devoted themselves to intensive research on an unprecedented scale. In 1940, Paul H. Landis' Rural Life in Process[16] and T. Lynn Smith's The Sociology of Rural Life[17] presented the results of two new and somewhat different attempts at sketching the over-all plan of the discipline. Two years later Rural Sociology and Rural Social Organization[18] set forth the results of Dwight Sanderson's lifetime of effort in the general work of synthesis.

The outstanding feature of the period under consideration, however, at least in immediate effects, was the activities of rural sociologists in connection with President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's "New Deal". Harry Hopkins had hardly set in motion (1933) the efforts of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration to pour relief funds into the states, before members of Congress and others began asking sharp questions as to exactly who was receiving the funds and what relation, if any, there was between need and aid. Hastily E. D. Tetreau and a few other rural sociologists were called to Washington and asked to help supply the answers. The co-operation of various rural sociologists at the state Agricultural Experiment Stations was asked for and promised. But it was not easy to organize the necessary surveys on the scale required, and considerable confusion resulted. Finally, Dwight Sanderson was asked to go to Washington, to take over as "Coordinator of Rural Research" for the federal agency, and to perfect an organization that could with dispatch secure and analyze the necessary facts. Sanderson wisely chose to depend chiefly upon rural sociologists located in the various states and, where possible, upon the members of the staffs of the agricultural experiment stations. In about one-half of the states a rural sociologist was given the title of State Director of Rural Research and a perdiem allowance for travel. Relief funds were authorized for the appointment of an assistant director in each case and for the employment of field enumerators and clerical assistants. Then these state organizations under-took two types of research activities: (1) execution in the selected areas of the plans fashioned at the national level; and (2) the conduct of approved and relevant projects which were locally designed. Literally hundreds of publications (articles, experiment station bulletins,

etc.) resulted from these efforts of which, naturally, those of nation-wide scope published as Research Monographs by the Works Progress Administration were the most important. Many of the state studies, though, produced results of great significance at the time, and the entire program constituted a fine testing and training ground for the young assistant directors many of whom continued to devote their lives to professional activities in the field of rural sociology. All in all, this activity in connection with the relief program was the dominant feature of rural sociology in the years 1933-1936. At Mississippi State University and some of the other schools, I believe, serious work in rural sociology pretty well dates from this period.

In the meanwhile, though, some rural sociologists, and Carl C. Taylor in particular, had been intensively engaged in the work of the Subsistence Homesteads Division of the Interior Department. Eventually, after various interdepartmental shifts and changes, Taylor was located in the United States Department of Agriculture as director of the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life and director of the Division of Social Research of the Resettlement Administration (later the Farm Security Administration). This was accompained by a greatly expanded program of rural sociological research on the part of the federal government, with part of its personnel stationed in various regional and state offices. The importance of Taylor's position as director of research for the Farm Security Administration declined, as did the agency itself, but the work of the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life became by far the most dominant element in the field of rural sociological research.

In summary, it can be said that very few, if any rural sociologists worked through the years between Franklin Delano Roosevelt's first inauguration and the attack upon Pearl Harbor without being intensively involved personally in the administrative and research activities of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (or Works Progress Administration), the Resettlement Administration (or Farm Security Administration), and the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Two other closely related developments during the period that greatly influenced the growth and development of rural sociology as a scientific discipline were the founding of the journal, Rural Sociology, and the organization of the Rural Sociological Society. Although a section on rural sociology had existed within the American Sociological Society since before 1920, the rural sociologists and others interested in the field felt an acute need for expanded and improved facilities for publishing the papers presented at the meetings. In 1935, after much discussion and debate, the Journal was established. For the first five years, Rural Sociology was published at Louisiana State University, after which it was transferred to North Carolina State College. Since 1952, editorial responsibilities for the Journal have been located at a number of land grant institutions, including the University of Kentucky.

In 1937, after the journal had been successfully launched, the affairs of the Rural Section within the American Sociological Society were brought to an end and the members proceeded to organize the Rural Sociological Society of America (later the Rural Sociological Society). The officers elected to serve the first year were as follows: Dwight Sanderson, President; John H. Kolb, Vice-president; T. Lynn Smith, Secretary-treasurer; and C. E. Lively and Carl C. Taylor, members of the executive committee.

A final development of considerable significance as rural sociology came of age in the period 1930-1945 was the substantial beginning of professional work abroad on the part of some of the more experienced rural sociologists. This was the initiation of a type of activity that, following the close of the second world war, became a principal endeavor on the part of many of the outstanding men in the field.

As is generally the case in the growth of new lines of endeavor, the start was slow and unspectaular. Shortly after 1920 E. C. Branson of the University of North Carolina recorded his observations of rural society in Europe in a small volume entitled Farm Life Abroad,[19] and in 1931 Walter A. Terpenning in his Village and Open-Country Neighborhoods,[20] published the results of systematic study, during the preceding years, of village patterns of settlement in European countries and their contrasts with the pattern prevailing in the United States. Carle C. Zimmerman spent the year 1930-31 in Siam making the systematic study of rural social organization and levels and standards of living which formed the basis for his volume Siam: Rural Economic Survey. Shortly thereafter, in 1934, Zimmerman was a member of the commission sent to Cuba by the Foreign Policy Association, and the results of his studies of rural family living formed a substantial part of the commission report on Problems of the New Cuba.[21] This seems to have been the first concrete step in the development of rural sociological interest in the area of Latin American studies. The following year Zimmerman, accompanied by T. Lynn Smith, made a reconaissance trip in Mexico (a great deal took place in rural sociology in 1935!); Zimmerman returned to Mexico the following year and Smith in 1938 for additional observation. In 1939, assisted by a Julius Rosenwald Foundation fellowship, Smith extended his observations to South America on a tour that took him briefly to all except one of the countries on the continent. Among the immediate results of this trip was the bringing of the noted Brazilian scholar, Arthur Ramos, to Louisiana State University as visiting professor (1940-41) and the introduction of the course on Latin American Institutions which Smith carried on in the years that followed. Apparently this was the first sociology course devoted to Latin America offered in a college or university in the United States.

Late in the fall of 1941, shortly before the attack upon Pearl Harbor, the U.S. Department of State decided to send three experienced rural sociologists to the embasies in Buenos Aires, Mexico City, and Rio de Janeiro, for the purpose of making systematic studies of rural life and rural society in Argentina, Mexico, and Brazil. Carl C. Taylor, Nathan L. Whetten, and T. Lynn Smith were the three selected for the assignments.

All four of these assignments were arranged by the State Department co-operating closely with the Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. They were all undertaken as a result of the ferment in Washington out of which eventually came the technical co-operation activities which came to be known as the Point-4 and later as the AID programs. Prominent in promoting the idea of such co-operative undertakings was M. L. Wilson, then director of the U.S. Agricultural Extension Service.

Shortly after he returned from Brazil in 1943, T. Lynn Smith was sent by the State Department of Colombia as advisor to the Colombian government on the problems and colonization (subdivision of estates) and settlement, with the additional duty of studying and reporting upon the cultural setting for agricultural extension activities in Colombia and in El Salvador. Approximately one-half of this time was spent on this work during the next three years. Then, as the period under consideration drew to a close, he was given another assignment to Brazil. There he did additional work in Goias, and then was sent as a member of a two-man U.S. -- Brazilian team to make a reconnaissance study of the Sao Francisco Valley in connection with proposals for developing the power potentials of the Paulo Afonso falls and the agricultural possibilities of the Valley.

During the closing years of the period George W. Hill went to Venezuela to work in the government's Institute of Immigration and Colonization, and as the end of hostilities in Europe approached Charles P. Loomis was sent there and Irwin T. Sanders then at the University of Kentucky was given (an overseas assignment) by the U.S. Department of State which eventually led to his study of the Balkan village.[22] Added to all of this, of course, were the experiences in all theatres of the global war on the part of the rural sociologists who were in the armed services, experiences which ultimately led some of them into professional rural sociological activities abroad.

Developments Since 1946

The happenings in rural sociology since the close of the second world war I shall mention only briefly, leaving to others the work of organizing the information about this into a meaningful body of knowledge. In closing, though, I will offer a few of my own ideas about some of the most important of the recent trends and developments.

Probably the most important overall development has been the concentration of work in rural sociology at the agricultural colleges and especially in the agricultural experiment stations. Before passage of the Purnell Act in 1925, relatively little rural sociological research was done at the agricultural experiment stations; and it is probable that the courses offered in the agricultural colleges ran a very poor second to those in church-related and private institutions of higher learning. In fact, nearly all of the research undertaken at the stations was on the projects that were financed in part by the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life in the U.S. Department of Agriculture, due, of course, to Dr. Galpin's interests and policies. Even after the Purnel Act was passed at full decade had to pass before rural sociological research got well established at some of the institutions that presently have the strongest programs. During the formative years, and in those of rapid growth and development as well, the research at the agricultural experiment stations and the courses at the agricultural colleges by no means had a monopoly on the field.

Since 1946, however, it has been very different. The bulletins, circulars, memoirs, and other publications issued by the agricultural experiment stations constitute the great bulk of rural sociological literature. The articles prepared for Rural Sociology are, for the most part, written by the personnel at the colleges and universities in which the agricultural experiment stations are located. Also in very large measure the rural sociologists who have pioneered the work in other countries are those who are, or were, at the time they began such activities, associated with the agricultural experiment stations.

Even the research activities of various federal agencies withered on the vine following 1945, so that in recent years the accomplishments of the rural sociological personnel remaining in the U.S. Department of Agriculture make a poor showing alongside the achievements between 1935 and 1945. This is true despite a high quality of work on the part of those now employed by the federal agencies. The dismemberment of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, and the severe budgetary curtailment of the lines of activity formerly embodied in the Division of Farm Population and Rural Life were, of course, the changes bringing about the decline of rural sociological work in the federal departments. The U.S. Department of Agriculture currently bears little resemblance whatsoever to the Department of Country Life envisioned by Theodore Roosevelt when he was president of the United States. With the federal agencies largely out of the rural sociological research picture, the concentration of the activities at the agricultural experiment stations has become more marked.

These changes in the organization of rural sociological activities have been paralleled by radical changes in the attention given various portions of the content or rural sociology. Certain parts

of rural sociology, once at the very core of interest and activity, have been largely neglected since 1946, others have maintained much their former relative importance, and there have been rapid strides taken in the development of new phases of the discipline. Each of these may be briefly commented upon in turn.

The rural church, the rural home and family, and standards and levels of living appear to be the areas of research which have been most largely neglected in recent years. Studies of rural social organization (including the community and the neighborhood), population, social stratification, man-land relationships, social participation, and social change seem to be receiving about as much attention as they did prior to 1946, although several of them are badly in need of comprehensive and systematic study.

At least five new or relatively new fields of study were developed rapidly by rural sociologists in the years following the close of the second world war, and the men working at southern universities have been responsible for many of the most significant results. These are: health and medical services; the diffusion (more accurately dissemination) of agricultural practices; aging and retirement; suburbanization; and rural society in other lands. Since 1945 the nation's rural sociologists have made major contributions by applying to the study of health, medical services, and hospital planning the knowledge they had acquired of population materials and analysis and of community delineation. The impetus in these fields seems likely to continue for some time to come.

Since 1945, too, rural sociologists have set about to investigate the nature of the social process by which new agricultural information and techniques get to and are applied by the farmers for whom they are intended. Accomplishments in the area are already substantial and may be expected to expand in the years immediately ahead

Rural sociologists have not remained entirely aloof of the challenges to research and action posed by the rapid aging on the part of the population of the United States. As a matter of fact some of them have pioneered in the study of aging and retirement, a highly logical development since their knowledge of demographic and survey techniques enabled them to get the answers of the more pressing questions with a minimum of wasted time and effort.

The problems of the rural-urban fringe and, indeed, the entire subject of suburbanization, is another field in which rural sociologists have led the way. This particular combination of the rural and urban ways of living is increasing apace in the United States.

Finally, the remarkable amount of work rural sociologists have done in other countires since 1945 requires special mention. This probably is the most significant development in rural sociology in

the last quarter of a century and also the one of great portent. U.S. rural sociologists have been working in most of the countries in the world, except those definitely in the Soviet sphere. Research has been their major activity, although many have functioned in administrative capacities in official or philanthropic projects, and a few have served as advisors to the governments of other countries. Some, but not many, have filled teaching engagements. The publication resulting from such activities already constitutes a formidable lot and it includes much of the most substantial work in rural sociology to be published in the period under consideration.

In conclusion, it seems necessary to add a few words about the present need for thorough-going endeavors at synthesis in the field of rural sociology. From 1930 on, analysis has greatly outstripped synthesis in the discipline. Since the third volume of A Systematic Book in Rural Sociology by Sorokin, Zimmerman, and Galpin appeared in 1932, the results of hundreds, if not thousands, of research endeavors have appeared in print. But attempts to systematize and organize the items of knowledge contained therein have been very modest. The most substantial contributions have been made in a few tests. But none of these is adequate.

An extraordinary effort to systematize the results of the rural sociological research in all parts of the world is the greatest need of the discipline as we move through the decade of the 1970's. Only then can the outstanding scientific work that has been done by the members of this group of rural sociologists in the Southern Agricultural Workers, that of their fellows throughout the South, and that of American rural sociologists generally become somewhat more readily available to the hundreds of hard-pressed governmental agencies and private organizations that are bewildered by the problems of societies in which the forces making for undirected, uncontrolled change are greatly in the ascendancy over those making for stability and strong insitutions.

Footnotes

[1]New York: Harper & Brothers.

[2]Published as Current Sociology--La Sociologie Contemporaine, Vol. VI, No. 1, by UNESCO, Paris.

[3]Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

[4]For a magnificent study of Knapp's life and work, see Joseph Cannon Bailey, Seaman A. Knapp, New York: Columbia University Press, 1945.

[5]Five of these are included in the bibliography in Smith, op. cit., p. 26.

[6]New York: The MacMillan Company, 1913.

[7]New York: George H. Doran Co., 1923.

[8]New York: The MacMillan Company. It is fitting and significant that George E. Vincent, the President of the University of Minnesota wrote the perspicuous two-page introduction to this, the first rural sociology text.

[9]New York: D. Appleton and Company.

[10]The work at Tulane was done by Augustus W. Hayes, whose study of seven Louisiana communities was published under the title Some Factors in Town and Country Relationships, New Orleans: Tulane University, 1922.

[11]The studies at Brigham Young were by Lowry Nelson, and are as follows: A Social Survey of Escalante, Utah, Provo: Brigham Young University, 1925; The Utah Farm Village of Ephraim, Provo: Brigham Young University, 1928; and Some Social and Economic Features of American Fork, Utah, Provo: Brigham Young University, 1933. I, myself, assisted with the statistical work on the study of Ephrain and did all of the interviewing in American Fork.

[12]The reference here is to A. B. Doggett, Jr., Three Negro Communities in Tidewater Virginia, Hampton: Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute Bulletin, Vol. 19, No. 4, 1923.

[13]Annotations relating to Brunner's work, which it may be said greatly underemphasized the importance of the South (where over half of the rural and rural-farm populations lived at the time he conducted his three nation-wide surveys) are given in Smith, op. cit., pp. 33, 34, 36, and 39.

[14]See especially Carle C. Zimmerman and Carl C. Taylor, Rural Organization: A Study of Primary Groups in Wake County, N. C., Raleigh: North Carolina Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin, No. 245, 1922; and Carl C. Taylor, Rural Sociology, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1926. For information about some of the studies published in other southern states during this period see Smith, op. cit., pp. 29-39.

[15]New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1933.

[16]New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

[17]New York: Harper & Brothers, 1940.

[18]New York: John Wiley & Sons.

[19]Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina.

[20]New York: D. Appleton-Century Company

[21]New York: Foreign Policy Association.

[22]Cf. Irwin T. Sanders, Balkan Village, Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1949.

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE SOUTHWESTERN LAND TENURE RESEARCH COMMITTEE*

A. L. Bertrand**

Insofar as I can determine, the Southwestern Land Tenure Research Committee was the first formally organized regional research group in the South which included rural sociologists among its members. This Committee traces back to informal talks begun at the Southwestern Social Science Association meetings in the late 1930's. The idea was formally discussed at a meeting sponsored by the Farm Foundation in Texarkana in December, 1939. However, the Committee was not organized until three months later at a meeting of heads of Agricultural Economics Departments from the States of Arkansas, Texas, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, held in Dallas, Texas (March, 1940).

The basic composition of the SLTRC included the heads of the departments of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology in the five state universities named above, plus a representative from the Division of Land Economics, U.S. Department of Agriculture and a representative from the Farm Foundation. In three of the states, since the departments of economics and sociology were combined under one head, one person represented both departments. In the remaining two states both a sociologist and an economist served on the committee.

The direction of the work of the SLTRC apparently was determined at a meeting held in St. Louis in February, 1941. This was a nation wide meeting sponsored by the Farm Foundation and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U.S.D.A., including the members of the North Central Regional Land Tenure Committee and the SLTRC. During the course of this meeting the Southern Group met independent of the North Central Group and planned its own program of research. It was decided by the members of SLTRC to focus efforts on two major fronts--tenure change and the impact of government programs on tenure.

---

*The materials presented came largely from two works edited by Harold Hoffsommer: Regional Research Cooperation (Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1949) and The Social and Economic Significance of Land Tenure in the Southwestern States: A Report of the Regional Tenure Research Project (Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1950).

**Professor of Sociology and Rural Sociology, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge.

A follow-up meeting to the St. Louis get-to-gether was held in Little Rock in August, 1941. Here, procedures and budgets were worked out for the research proposed and plans were made to seek Foundation support for a "Southwestern Land Tenure Regional Research Project". The SLTRC met again in St. Louis in January, 1942 for the purpose of presenting the research proposal to representatives of the General Education Board and Farm Foundation. The outcome of this and later meetings was the receipt of a $150,000 grant from the GEB and of a somewhat smaller sum from the Farm Foundation. Each of the Cooperating states also pledged varying amounts to support personnel, travel and other research related activities.

The next move by the SLTRC was to set up their regional project headquarters at the University of Arkansas and to select a regional director and staff. The director chosen Harold Hoffsommer, was a member of the original SLTRC and a sociology faculty member from LSU. He explains how the project was implemented as follows:

> As already stated, the Regional Committee sponsored the Project. Each committee member headed the work in his state. He was the project leader unless he turned over this function to someone else. The states varied in organization at this point from that where the head of the department (the committee member) was entirely responsible for the detailed conduct of the Project within his state to an arrangement whereby essentially the whole collaboration on the Project was turned over to a member of the department.
>
> The Committee determined that any regional employee, while working in a given state, was to be under the direct supervision of the project leader in the state in which he was working. The state project leader was thus responsible for the accurate collection of the intensive survey data within his state, and regional employees when working in individual states were to have the same status as state department members. Actually, of course, the regional employees, having worked on the same material in several states, were in a position to enrich the work in the several states on the basis of their wider experiences.

The above special project of the SWLTRC lasted for a period of four years. During that time, some $375,000 was expended for a comprehensive research program. The findings of this research appear in summary form in the volume entitled, The Social and Economic Significance of Land Tenure in the Southwestern States, edited by Hoffsommer and published by the University of North Carolina Press in 1950.

Over the years that the special project of the SWLTRC was active, many bulletins, monographs, and articles were developed. These materials were generally sponsored by the regional project staff but accomplished cooperatively with representatives from the separate experiment stations. It may be of some interest to present the working arrangement and the persons involved in this major research endeavor. Hoffsommer includes the following statement in the preface to the book identified above:

> The Project was carried forward by the members of the Departments of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology in the Agricultural Colleges of the five cooperating states, representatives of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the special regional staff which gave full-time to the effort.
>
> The cooperating personnel functioned more or less in groups in accordance with the stage of Project development. Schedule committees, guided by the pattern developed by the Project as a whole, designed the schedules. Field workers collected the survey information, clerical and supervisory workers tabulated it, and six workers' conferences planned the type of tabulation and analysis to be made, and finally the materials were assembled into a report.
>
> The data presented in the report result from the close cooperation of a great many people. The personnel of the committees who developed the farm and family field schedule was as follows: Joseph Ackerman, Desmond Anker, Roy A. Ballinger, Frank Barlow, Raleigh Barlowe, Alvin L. Bertrand, Robert Bowlus, C. A. Bonner, M. S. Brooks, J. L. Charlton, Chris Henderson, E. L. Langsford, A. C. Magee, Don A. Marshall, Robert McMillan, T. J. Nelley, Joe R. Motheral, W. G. O'Leary, Otis Osgood, Herbert Pryor, Ralph J. Ramsey, R. J. Saville, W. H. Sewell, T. J. Standing, Howard Stover, Frank J. Welch, Paul Williamson, W. T. Wilson, and Martin Woodin.
>
> The following persons, apart from members of the regional staff were members of one or more of the six workers' conferences: Joseph Ackerman, Oscar F. Allen, Desmond Anker, Robert Bowlus, P. N. Bragg, J. L. Charlton, K. C. Davis, Marshall Harris, T. R. Hedges, Steen C. Lemon, A. C. Magee, Don Marshall, Robert McMillan, D. Gray Miley, J. Lambert Molyneaux, Joe R. Motheral, W. G. O'Leary, Otis Osgood, Julien Tatum, and H. P. Todd.
>
> The regional staff personnel resident at and working full time in the regional office for either a part of the Project or for its duration were as follows: Harold Hoffsommer,

Director; Howard Stover, Statistician and Agricultural Economist; Merton Oyler, Rural Sociologist; Ralph Ramsey, Associate Rural Sociologist; Harald Pedersen, Assistant Rural Sociologist; J. Joe Reed, Agricultural Economist; I. W. Moomaw, Associate Agricultural Economist; Raleigh Barlowe, Assistant Agricultural Economist; Luther Bohanan, Assistant Agricultural Economist; Harold Scoggins, Assistant Agricultural Economist; and Betsy Castelberry, Junior Statistician.

In addition to the above Hoyle Southern and Erling D. Solberg of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U.S. Department of Agriculture, were associated full time with the regional staff for a part of the Project's duration.

The SWLTRC continued to function after its special project was terminated. Periodic meetings were held and the research of the various participants reflected the thinking and recommendations of the Committee. However, by 1960, it became evident that tenure problems were no longer the overriding problem issue in the South and Southwest. It seemed time to turn to other research focuses. The SWLTRC decided to disband itself in 1961, but approved the sponsored one final project. This was the production of a book on the general topic of rural land tenure in the U.S.. The SWLTRC gave primary editorial responsibility to two of its members from L.S.U.. Alvin L. Bertrand (Rural Sociologist) was elected editor-in-chief and Floyd L Corty (Agricultural Economist) was elected assistant editor.

This final project of the SWLTRC was completed in 1962 with the publication of Rural Land Tenure in the United States (A Socio-economic Approach to Problems, Programs and Trends) by Louisiana State University Press.

Section II

H I S T O R Y

ORGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF REGIONAL RURAL SOCIOLOGICAL RESEARCH IN THE SOUTH

E. V. Smith*

Shortly after I became Assistant Dean and Director at Auburn University in 1944, I heard President Emeritus F. D. Farrell of Kansas State University plead the case for rural sociology before the Experiment Station Section of the Land Grant College Association. As I remember his presentation, he acknowledged rural sociology to be a young and inexact area of social science and urged the Experiment Station Directors to be tolerant, sympathetic, and supportive.

At that time, most of the State Experiment Stations were meagerly financed. This was particularly true in the South. Furthermore, most of the directors had come from disciplines that had already developed objective research procedures. Consequently, although the directors were sympathetic, few were willing to allocate scarce resources to encourage a young field or to fund research that they considered to lack preciseness and objectivity.

The passage of the Research and Marketing Act of 1946 (later to be combined with other Acts as Hatch, Amended) by a National Congress offered hope for a broadened program of research in the State Stations. First, the Act authorized increased annual appropriations although several years were to elapse before actual appropriation equaled authorization. Secondly, the Act specified that 20 per cent of the funds appropriated be expended in support of marketing research. Finally, it provided that not more than 25 per cent of the funds appropriated be used for cooperative research on problems of concern to two or more states; this portion of the Act became known as the Regional Research Fund and the research it supported as regional research.

Increased Federal-formula funds during the late 1940's and 1950's enabled the State Experiment Stations to strengthen programs of research in which they had been weak and to initiate research in new areas. Departments and individuals research workers saw this as an opportunity to increase support for their specific projects. Thus, considerable competition developed for "RMA" funds.

---

* Dean and Director Emeritus, School of Agriculture and Agricultural Experiment Station, Auburn University.

Furthermore, individual scientists and disciplines seemed to feel that special prestige would accrue from the approval and funding of a regional research project. The promise of funding and prestige no doubt encouraged the ad hoc Committee of Southern Rural Sociologists to approach the Southern Experiment Station Directors during the mid-1950's as recorded in Dr. Kaufman's excellent historical paper entitled "Cooperative Effort Among Rural Sociologists in the South During the Fifties."

The procedures followed in the origination and approval of regional research projects during the mid-1950's were essentially as follows. Scientists in the same or related disciplines recoginzed a problem common to two or more states' agriculture or rural people which they believed to be ammenable to cooperative research. A brief outline of the problem and a proposal for cooperative research was prepared and submitted to the Chairman of the Regional Association of Experiment Station Directors. The research proposal was reviewed at a subsequent meeting of the directors. If they considered it to have merit and to be high priority, a "field of work" was established, a director was appointed as administrative adviser, and authorization was given to establish a regional technical committee and to develop a regional project outline. The administrative adviser then contacted the other directors, notified them that a technical committee was being formed, asked them to designate a technical representative if they were interested in participating in the proposed regional research, and set a date for the first meeting of a technical committee.

The first task of a technical committee was to delineate the objectives of the proposed research and to develop a satisfactory regional project outline. When the regional and state contributing projects were approved by the directors, the Committee of Nine, and the Office of Experiment Stations (now Cooperative State Research Service), cooperative regional research would be activated with RRF support.

Generally at the first meeting, the technical committee was formally organized and officers elected from its membership. The committee was largely responsible for the development of the regional project outline and for the prosecution of the authorized cooperative research, with administrative guidance, encouragement, and sometimes restraint provided by the administrative adviser and the Cooperative State Research Service representative. Cooperation by appropriate USDA agencies was encouraged.

The proposal submitted, in 1956, by Dr. Kaufman to Director R. D. Lewis, then Chairman of The Southern Directors, followed essentially the route outlined in the previous paragraphs. It was exhaustively discussed by the directors and a "field of work in Rural Sociology," with the designation SP-29, was authorized.

I volunteered for the assignment of administrative adviser, although I had no experience in rural sociology. My rationale for acceptance was simple. Even though agricultural science organizations were, and still are, often criticized as being more concerned with the problems of pigs and potatoes than of people, I had always believed that Experiment Station administrators were interested in crops, livestock and forests primarily because these resources contribute to human welfare. Therefore, I welcomed the opportunity for administrative association with a discipline whose research would deal directly with people.

Following the authorization of a field of work in rural sociology, SP-29, the job of translating it into a viable, operating regional project was tenuous and long. More than two years were to elapse before regional project S-44 was formalized and numerous committee and subcommittee meetings were required. There were many reasons for this.

Although the directors had authorized a field of work, their discussion of the Kaufman proposal suggested that they were more interested in funding a project dealing with a major problem or rural people in the South than in establishing a project relating to a specific discipline. Feeling that social and economic problems were closely related, as administrative adviser I invited directors to send rural sociologists, agricultural economists, and home economists to the organizational meeting. The interchange of ideas among representatives of a number of disciplines was fruitful and added materially in the ultimate selection of a major area for cooperative regional research. It soon became evident, however, that at that point in time a manageable project could hardly be developed to attract and maintain the participation of representatives of divergent disciplines. Thus, the technical committee that evolved became essentially a Committee or rural sociologists.

Subsequently, the technical committee experienced difficulty in reaching consensus on the area of research to be undertaken. Although the number of rural sociologists in the South was small, there were strong personalities among them who had definite interest fields. Some of these who were not able to "sell" their special interests to their peers as the central focus for the proposed regional project or who were deeply committed elsewhere soon disassociated themselves from the technical committee. Others remained to form the nucleus of the group of rural sociologists who decided that rural poverty was a pressing social problem and that it would be the focus for the evolving regional project.

Next, the Committee had to decide whether the project would be truly regional or a "Mother Hubbard" which would provide an umbrella to shelter a collection of more or less related state projects. After much discussion, the decision was reached to develop a truly regional projects involving a systematically drawn regional sample. At this point, SP-29 was replaced by regional project S-44 entitled:

"Factors in the Adjustment of Families and Individuals to Changing Conditions in Low Income Rural Areas of the South."

The success or failure of any regional projects depends primarily on two factors. One is the ability (or lack of it) of the members of the technical committee to cooperate effectively and to vigorously prosecute their research. The second, on which the first is somewhat dependent, is the identification of "natural leaders" and their exerting effective leadership. By both criteria, S-44 and its successors have been successful regional projects. In retrospect, the temptation to identify these natural leaders is compelling. Their contributions were such, however, that they are known by their peers and hence they shall remain anonymous here. The gentle, steadying influence of Dr. Paul J. Jehlik, CSRS representative, was such that one would be remiss in not publicly recognizing it in a document dealing with the origin and development of cooperation in rural sociological research in the South.

The contributions of S-44 and its successors have been many and varied. To begin with, the S-44 technical committee was foresighted in the selection of a major problem for research. Consequently, a considerable body of published and unpublished research results had been developed by the committee and was available to policy and action agencies when national domestic policy was focused on the poverty problem during the decade of the sixties. Secondly, it has been noted previously that there were relatively few rural sociologists in Southern institutions during the early 1950's, and it is noteworthy further that many of them were situated in Colleges of Arts and Sciences rather than in Colleges of Agriculture. In contrast, most Southern Agricultural Experiment Stations today include rural sociologists on their research faculties. Finally, the rural sociologists who constituted the S-44 and subsequent regional technical committees have contributed through their research accomplishments to the "visibility" of the profession of rural sociology in the South and the Nation.

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH EFFORTS AMONG RURAL SOCIOLOGISTS IN THE SOURH DURING THE FIFTIES

Harold F. Kaufman*

This is an effort to sketch a series of events through the decade of the fifties which culminated in the organization of the first regional research project, S-44, and in the first regional field work in the summer of 1960. The decade of the fifties was a critical one for regional cooperation for rural sociologists because this was the period in which the efforts of a few persons became translated into greatly expanded interests on the part of many persons and into effectively organized endeavors.

The activity during the decade may be classified in terms of the three related but differently focused events. The first was the Committee on Community Study which continued for four or five years. The second phase was a transition to a broader concern including both research and teaching efforts in the field of rural sociology. The third phase, beginning officially in 1957 with the preliminary project SP-29, deals with the development of the regional project on the Adjustment of Low Income Families, better known as S-44.

Committee on Community Study

The first event of the decade was the organization of "Workshop on Community Development in the South." This workshop was made up of two sessions of the Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology Section of the ASAW meeting held in Memphis in February 1951. For the 1951 meeting, Kaufman was chairman of the Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology Section and had worked with Frank Alexander who took leadership in organizing the workshop. A report of the workshop is found in Appendix 1.

The Committee on Community Study had four more formal and relatively well attended meetings during the next three years. The second was held as a section of the ASAW meeting in Atlanta in February 1952.[1] The third meeting financed by a grant from TVA was held in Atlanta in June

---

* Research Professor of Sociology, Mississippi State University.

[1] An announcement of this is to be found in the ASAW program for that year.

of 1952 at the YMCA. The fourth meeting was in Chattanooga in March 1953 and the fifth meeting was in Atlanta in March of 1954.

Beginning with the Atlanta meeting in February 1952 a concentrated effort was made to involve black sociologists. That this effort was successful is seen by the list of persons attending found in Appendix 2, which gives the participants of the Atlanta meeting in June 1952 and Chattanooga in June 1953. It is of interest to note that the participation on the part of blacks and the problems discussed anticipated the concerns of the seventies when attention was focused by white rural sociologists on the colleges of 1890.

The discussions on community research through the four year period had the effect of broadening the focus for the continuing group so that by 1954 there was explicit concern for research in rural sociology not only in community but also in other subject matter areas.

Toward the Organization of Southern Rural Sociologists

In the search for funds for community research, contacts were made with foundations and related groups. Suggestions were made by these organizations as well as the sociologists that research interests should be broadened. The Farm Foundation suggested that it could possibly provide financial support for a group of southern rural sociologists if the request for organization came through the Committee of Southern Experiment Station Directors. The Foundation had had the experience of helping to organize the North Central Committee in Rural Sociology a few years earlier.

In 1954 the Regional Project in Agricultural Communication was created at Michigan State, and the project director, Stanley Andrews, made contact with interested rural sociologists throughout the country. A meeting was arranged for several rural sociologists, some of whom had worked on the Community Research Committee, for a conference during the ASAW meeting in Louisville in February 1955, with Dr. John Parsey of the NPAC. By this time the leadership group in community study began to see that it was desirable that, for organizational purposes, the field of rural sociology be emphasized rather than only one subject matter. Frank Alexander made a call to a dozen or more rural sociologists most of whom had attended one or more of the previous meetings held in Nashville during the meeting of a Southern Sociological Society in late March 1955. See Appendix 3 for a copy of a letter from Kaufman to Alexander anticipating this meeting and reformulating the orientation of the group.

During the spring and early summer of 1955, Kaufman had correspondence with both the Farm Foundation and the NPAC with respect to paying travel expenses for a meeting of southern rural sociologists with the view of setting up a continuing organization of some type. The Farm Foundation officials discussed the matter with NPAC and agreed by late summer to support such a meeting. This meeting was planned and held in Atlanta in February 1956. Bertrand was elected provisional secretary and Kaufman the provisional chairman. One or more representatives were present from the sociology groups in Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas, as well as representatives from four USDA agencies and two officials each from the Farm Foundation and the NPAC.

A productive two-day conference was held. A committee made up of Hamilton, Skrabanek, and Hitt, with Kaufman as chairman was delegated to present the case for a Southern Rural Sociology Research Committee to the southern directors. A copy of Kaufman's letter to Director Lewis, chairman of the southern directors, and a proposal for the organization of the Rural Sociology Committee is found in Appendix 4. Several of the group meeting in Atlanta met again during the meeting of the Rural Sociological Society at Michigan State in September 1956. Hamilton served as chairman of this meeting in the absence of Kaufman.

During the summer of 1956, conversations between the rural sociologists and the southern directors resulted in the directors' turning down a request to support a general committee like the one in the North Central states but suggesting that the rural sociologists should consider a proposal for a technical committee in a specific subject matter field. Accordingly, two work groups to draw up proposals, one in agricultural communications and the other in health services, were organized and asked to complete their work by early fall in anticipation of a meeting that might be called by the southern directors early in 1957.

Two relevant comments on the above are (1) that the request made by Kaufman in 1956 was almost identical to the one accepted by the southern directors when made by Cleland ten years later and (2) the work of rural sociologists, NPAC, and others during the mid-fifties influenced the southern directors to consider the work of rural sociologists more seriously.

Organization of the Technical Committee

In the late summer of 1956, Dean E. V. Smith of Auburn was selected by the southern directors as the administrative advisor for the new technical group in rural sociology designated as SP-29. Smith, working through the directors in the several stations, called an organizational meeting to be held in Birmingham on February 6-7, 1957. Nine of the thirteen southern stations, plus Puerto Rico, sent representatives.

Also represented were several USDA agencies, the NPAC, and social scientists other than those as designated representatives. Kaufman was elected temporary chairman of this group and Coleman as temporary secretary. Reports from each state indicated research activities and interests that might contribute to a regional project. Two subcommittees were created to draw up statements: one on agricultural communications and the other on the adjustment potentials of families in low income rural areas.

The second meeting of SP-29 was held the next year, April 15-16, 1958, in Birmingham. During the interim, a highly general project statement on the adjustment of rural families had been prepared and served as a basis for the southern directors removing the rural sociology project from its temporary status and giving it the S-44 number. At the 1958 meeting Lee Coleman was appointed as chairman of a committee of five to prepare a more precise statement of the regional project. Later Milton Coughenour, also of Kentucky, replaced Coleman on this committee.

The first report on S-44 was for the year 1958. Five states took part in this report, namely, Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Texas. In the 1959 report two more states were added--Alabama and Tennessee. The work done during these two years was on state projects that were designated as contributing to the regional project.

For two years the Technical Committee struggled with the problem of whether it wanted a truly regional project and if so how to develop it. Perhaps the most critical meeting in the life of S-44 was held in Birmingham, April 27-29, 1959 when it was decided to establish a truly regional project which meant developing a regional schedule and taking a regional sample. In order to carry out this extensive assignment, it was necessary to call a second meeting of the Committee during the year. The second meeting was held in Memphis on October 4-6, 1959. At this time subcommittees were set up to develop a regional schedule and to carry out regional sampling. Coughenour was chairman of the first committee and McCann of North Carolina was chairman of the second one. McCann also served as secretary of the Technical Committee.

A meeting to finalize the schedule and the sample procedure was held in Birmingham in February 1960. The first field work on the regional project was done in the summer of 1960 in six states. The annual meeting of the Committee for the year was held in Birmingham in October. At this time Nelson of Texas, who had served as vice-chairman of the committee for the past year, was elected as chairman to succeed Kaufman who had been serving in this capacity since the organization of the Committee.

APPENDIX 1

WORKSHOP ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOUTH

Frank D. Alexander, Government Research Branch, TVA, Knoxville, Tenn.

Twenty-nine persons attended the Workshop. Representatives from seven Southern states, i.e., Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Tennessee, made reports. In addition, written reports were sent in from Kentucky, Oklahoma and South Carolina.

Two sessions were held, one from 2:00-4:30 p.m., and the other from 7:30-9:30 p.m., February 5, 1951. The first session was devoted to reports describing community development programs and activities, current research on the community, and research needed. These reports were prepared sufficiently in advance to permit their being mimeographed for circulation at the meeting. The reports on community development programs and activities were prepared by organization and community specialists from state extension services, those on current research by sociologists from the colleges and universities, and those on needed research by both the extension specialists and sociologists. Two representatives from the Federal Extension Office in Washington also participated. Dr. Wayland J. Hayes from the Department of Sociology, Vanderbilt University, reviewed and evaluated the material presented at the first session. The reports on community development programs revealed how extensive as well as varied are the current activities in this field; the research reports indicated that research on the community is restricted, although a few significant projects are under way. Dr. Hayes in his evaluating statement made this significant suggestion: "It appears reasonable to suggest that persons who are continually occupied with the organization and development of other people might be willing to examine the organization and development of their own profession. What is the nature of training received by community specialists? What is the relation of these specialists 'out on the firing line' to men doing research relevant to their work? What research is relevant, and what access do practitioners have to it? Is there any middleman or transmission agency between those engaged in research and the practitioner?"

The evening session was devoted to the preparation of special committee reports in the light of the facts and their evaluation as presented in the afternoon session. A committee of participants was assigned to each of the following topics: common understanding required for those concerned with community development, significant activities in research sociology in the field of the community, significant activities in extension sociology and extension organization and planning in the field of the community, some basic principles and policies regarding the

APPENDIX 1 (continued)

relationship of extension activities and research sociology. After some forty minutes of discussion, reports were made by these committees to the entire Workshop. A mimeographed report of the Workshop will be prepared and distributed to the participants and others who may be interested.

--Proceedings, Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Memphis, Tennessee, February 5-7, 1951, pp. 13-14.

APPENDIX 2

List of Persons Attending Meetings on Community Study

1. Persons attending meeting at Chattanooga, March 26, 1953

Howard W. Beers	University of Kentucky
Lee Coleman	University of Kentucky
Allen D. Edwards	Winthrop College
A. Alexander Fanelli	Mississippi State College
Manet Fowler	Tuskegee Institute
Wayland Hayes	Vanderbilt University
Harold F. Kaufman	Mississippi State College
Irene Johnson	Tuskegee Institute
Jitsuichi Masuoka	Fisk University
Haskel Miller	University of Chattanooga
Ernest E. Neal	Tuskegee Institute
Raymond Payne	Mississippi State College
Albert J. Reiss, Jr.	Vanderbilt University
Adella Shields	Tuskegee Institute
Willis A. Sutton, Jr.	University of Kentucky

2. Persons attending Atlanta meeting, June 25-26, 1952

Frank D. Alexander	Tennessee Valley Authority
Lee Coleman	University of Kentucky
Allen D. Edwards	Winthrop College
A. T. Hansen	University of Alabama
Wayland J. Hayes	Vanderbilt University
Harold F. Kaufman	Mississippi State College
Hyland Lewis	Atlanta University
Jitsuichi Masuoka	Fisk University
Selz C. Mayo	North Carolina State College
Ernest E. Neal	Tuskegee Institute
Julien Tatum	University of Mississippi
W. B. Jones, Jr.	Save the Children Federation, University of Tennessee
James W. Wiggins	Emory University
R. C. Stuart, Jr.	American Institute of Planners
George Gant	Southern Regional Education Board
Harry Williams	Southern Regional Education Board

APPENDIX 3

March 11, 1955

Dr. Frank D. Alexander
Tennessee Valley Authority
501 New Sprinkle Building
Knoxville, Tennessee

Dear Frank:

It was good to have you with us this week. We made some definite progress, although, of course, there are many pressing problems still facing us. As the matter rests with respect to a rural sociology committee, you seem to feel that not much could be done at the present time of a general nature, and because of the fact that neither Beers nor I will be in Nashville I was not in a position to challenge that attitude.

My studied view, however, is that a Southern Committee on Rural Sociology is much needed. It should be made up of representatives from departments of sociology and government bureaus working in the thirteen Southern states which are carrying on organized research programs in rural sociology. Each department or agency should have one representative on the general committee. This person would be nominated by the department head and approved by the dean or comparable administrator.

The purpose of the committee would be the promotion and development of rural sociology in the South. This would be done (1) through providing a clearing house for the sharing of experiences, (2) through the organization of section meetings in the ASAW, in the Southern Sociological Society, and in the Southwestern Social Science Association, (3) through the securing of funds and cooperation in regional research projects, and (4) the stimulation of interest in the organization of rural sociology programs in institutions which now do not have such work.

The function of this general committee would be that of coordination and policy making. The specific projects and programs would be carried out by the several sub-committees and work groups. Our present committee on community study would be one of these. Other sub-committees which would no doubt soon be organized would be one on population and communications. The membership of these work groups would be made up not only of the rural sociology departments but also might well include other sociologists and other social scientists.

APPENDIX 3 (continued)

The immediate steps that I think we should take include both an attempt to organize a project on communications and second, to enlist interest in a general committee. We are starting with Hamilton, Alexander, and Kaufman. We should next get specific reaction from Beers and Hitt and then move on to enlist any other interested departments.

Cordially,

Harold F. Kaufman

HFK/mw

cc: Dr. C. Horace Hamilton

APPENDIX 4

February 27, 1956

Mr. R. D. Lewis, Director
Agricultural Experiment Station
Texas A&M College
College Station, Texas

Dear Director Lewis:

For several years rural sociologists and others interested in this field have felt the need for some formalized method of cooperation in Experiment Station research in the South. There have been a number of contacts, but nothing of a formalized nature which would allow work across the entire region. Accordingly, a group of rural sociologists requested the Farm Foundation to sponsor a meeting to consider the formation of a southwide committee on rural sociology. This request was granted and a planning meeting was held on February 8 and 9 in Atlanta immediately following the annual convention of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers.

The planning group set up a provisional committee comprised of Dr. Homer Hitt, Head of the Rural Sociology Department at Louisiana State University; Dr. Horace Hamilton, Head of the Rural Sociology Department at North Carolina State College; Dr. Robert Skrabanek, Associate Professor of your institution, and myself as chairman. This committee was authorized to request your organization of Southern Experiment Station Directors for formal recognition and support. A copy of our proposal is attached.

At our conference considerable time was spent discussing research areas in which regional cooperation was much needed. Special attention was given to the area of agricultural communications. Some gudielines for a regional project in this field were spelled out. Other areas in which cooperative activity might be organized in the future are community development, sociology of health, and sociology of marketing.

Sincerely yours,

Harold F. Kaufman, Head

HFK:mw

APPENDIX 4 (continued)

Proposal for the Formation of a
Southern Rural Sociology Committee

Purpose of the Committee

To stimulate and to coordinate rural sociological research on problems of regional significance. This regional cooperation would help to multiply our results by avoiding duplication and by stimulating widespread participation and by involving the most competent personnel available.

Organization of the Committee

The committee would be composed of one rural sociologist from each of the 13 Southern states having an organized program of research in the field. The representatives would be appointed by the Directors of the respective Agricultural Experiment Stations.

The work of the committee would be carried on through work groups, subcommittees, or technical committees. The individuals comprising the membership of these groups would be appointed by the general rural sociology committee on the basis of their interests and competence.

Financial Support

The Farm Foundation and the National Program in Agricultural Communications financed the preliminary planning meeting. The Farm Foundation states that they would entertain requests from a formally approved Southern Rural Sociology Committee to finance travel for the meeting of the committee and of subcommittees. It is believed that the possibility of getting support for research from such foundations as the National Program in Agricultural Communications and others and funds for regional research from the U.S. Department of Agriculture would be greatly enhanced by the activities of a Southern Rural Sociology Committee.

SOUTHERN REGIONAL RESEARCH IN RURAL SOCIOLOGY DURING THE SIXTIES*

C. L. Cleland**

The period of the fifties set the stage for a substantial expansion of research which was truly regional in character. Additional funding, an increasing national concern with low-income people and support from the Experiment Station directors combined to permit the addition of rural sociologists in a number of states and to encourage their collaboration on problems of regional importance. Kaufman has described along with other projects the antecedents and early stages of the S-44 project which was designed to examine the adjustments people living in rural low-income areas had made while the economy of the rest of the nation flourished.

The Southern Regional Rural Sociology Projects

The S-44 project, hereafter referred to as the Adjustment Study, was a study of poverty in the South conducted at a time when political forces were denying that poverty existed in the region. The interest of the researchers was principally one of describing the situation of the families living in low income rural areas. This interest included setting the information collected through a survey in the proper context with respect to data from secondary sources and other local information sources. Some forces in the South had been interested in the poor people but their voices were few in number and their impact was limited. The Adjustment Study researchers were attempting to document living conditions in a way which could not be easily refuted by the politician or other apologists for the region.

Through the encouragement of Dean Smith, administrative advisor for the project, and the willingness of the participants in the Adjustment Study to limit the exclusive pursuit of their individual interests, the study became truly regional with a systematically drawn sample and a

---

*This is an abbreviated version of a paper presented at the meeting of the Rural Sociology Section of ASAW, Atlanta, Georgia, February 5, 1973.

**Ombudsman and Professor of Rural Sociology, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

40/41
p. 40 is blank

carefully developed schedule of questions to be used by the interviewers in the various states. The emphasis in the project became more explicitly sociological with a deemphasis on the economics as agricultural economists were replaced on the technical committee by rural sociologists. Even so, the data collected included a large measure of economic information which the sociologists had a little difficulty utilizing as effectively as economists might have.

The Adjustment Study did provide a great deal of interaction among the rural sociologists involved which engendered a strong feeling of commitment to the region. This was reflected in their willingness to collect some data in which various individuals did not have a strong professional interest and to be responsible for certain types of service or data analysis which did not contribute directly to one's own immediate welfare. There was a complete exchange among the participating states of the survey data collected and a division of responsibility for its analysis.

The functioning of the project as a truly regional effort was recognized in the circle of the directors, as well as in other groups, due largely to the efforts of Dean Smith and Paul Jehlik. The project proved to be productive in terms of the number of papers, reports, articles, and bulletins produced. The names of the principal researchers involved appears in Appendix 1. This appendix also includes a list of the officers who served in each year of the project's existence, the month and place of each annual meeting and the subcommittees which were active during various phases of the project along with the chairmen of such committees.

Transition From Adjustment to Mobility

The S-44 study of adjustment was scheduled to come to a close in mid 1964. The project was granted a one year extension to complete the analyses of the data collected and to publish the results of the study. This time was also used to decide whether to revise the project and get a further extension or to replace it with a new project. The decision arrived at was something of a compromise with the project developed including a follow-up on the households previously interviewed, an examination of the circumstances of migrants from these households and a determination of the outlook of other young people in the study counties. This project focused on the change processes and is referred to hereafter as the Mobility Study.

During the period approaching the transition, two very active rural sociologists became part of the personnel resources of the South and were influential in the direction of the regional project work. Bill Kuvlesky moved to Texas A&M from Pennsylvania State and John Kelley moved to the University of Georgia from San Fernando State College in California.

It was about this time that former President Johnson launched his "War on Poverty" and created the Office of Economic Opportunity. Dean Smith felt that such an organization should have the benefit of our research based knowledge and arranged for a seminar of the Adjustment Study personnel and selected other rural social scientists with some of those responsible for the OEO programs. This seminar had about 30 participants and the need for the types of information being provided by the regional projects was brought home very sharply. (See Appendix 2 for a list of the participants.)

One of the principal outcomes of the seminar with OEO was the publication of two volumes which attempted to pull together the numerous reports prepared in connection with the Adjustment Study.[1] Virlyn Boyd of Clemson who had not been a participant in the earlier study but who had a real interest in the Mobility Study was able to arrange for time to gather and publish an annotated bibliography of the Adjustment Study materials along with a separate volume which synthesized the various reports from the study. The experience of dealing with a governmental bureaucracy at the Washington level was educational for all of the participants.

The Mobility Study, designated as S-61, got underway early in 1965 in terms of the plans for data collection and the general ideas about analysis even though officially it didn't start until July. The project statement reflected a number of different interests possessed by the participating rural sociologists. The final product essentially incorporated three projects under one heading. The first of these was a follow-up of the Adjustment Study families the second was to involve following the children who had migrated from the Adjustment Study families, and the third one was to concentrate on the aspirations and expectations of high school students both with respect to their education and their future occupations in the areas where the Adjustment Study had been carried out.

The pursuit of the various objectives of the mobility study ultimately depended upon the interest of a given individual or at best a small group of two or three individuals. The interest in pursuing the children of the Adjustment Study families rested principally with C. Horace Hamilton. When Dr. Hamilton experienced some illness and found other areas to be of greater interest, the leadership for this particular part of the project vanished. As a result the technical committee formally dropped that objective about midway in the course of the study.

---

[1]Virlyn A. Boyd and Carolyn A. Morgan, Synthesis of Findings from Southern Regional Cooperative Research Project S-44: Factors in the Adjustment of Families and Individuals in Low-Income Rural Areas of the South, AE 290, South Carolina AES, March 1966; and Carolyn A. Morgan and Virlyn A. Boyd, Annotated Bibliography of Publications and Reports Resulting from Southern Regional Cooperative Research Project S-44: Factors in the Adjustment of Families and Individuals in Low-Income Rural Areas of the South, AE 289, South Carolina AES, March 1966.

The productivity in terms of reports, theses, etc., from the Mobility Study came mostly from the group interested in the high school students and most of these were under the direction of Bill Kuvlesky. The follow-up of the Adjustment Study families resulted in very few reports. (See Appendix 3 for a list of the participants and offices held in the technical committee.)

During the course of the mobility study, there was some concern expressed among the members that there was insufficient time to discuss matters of more general concern to the participants in the project. From 1965 through 1967 the only opportunities for rural sociologists in the South to get together as a regional group occurred through the meetings of the regional project technical committee. The Association of Southern Agricultural Workers did have a section for agricultural economics and rural sociology but it was clearly dominated by the agricultural economists. Normally there was only a half day session devoted to papers by rural sociologists. While this served the interest of interdisciplinary contact, it did not rank high in professional prestige, particularly among the sociologists, with the result that little attention was given to such meetings.

It should be noted that during the decade there were also rural sociologists involved in two redated regional projects which were conducted mainly by personnel in departments of Family Life and Child Development in Colleges of Home Economics. These projects had very rigorous sample designs aimed at testing relationships between mobility aspirations and parental influences on self-perception. Rural sociologists participating included Lee Coleman and Alfred Mirande at Kentucky, Joseph Garza, Wesley Baird and Richard Butler at Mississippi State and James Montgomery at V.P.I.

Given the limited opportunity for exploring other interests in the technical committee meetings, a renewed interest was expressed in establishing a committee supported by the Farm Foundation which could range freely over the various types of research interests of rural sociologists. At the same time, the agricultural economists in the region were feeling problems concerning outlets for publication of research reports and were in the process of organizing a Southern Agricultural Economics Association. This group took the place of the agricultural economics part of the joint section with rural sociology in the ASAW. It appeared that this action was going to leave the rural sociologists without a meaningful place in the ASAW.

Dan Alleger was scheduled to become chairman of the joint agricultural economics and rural sociology section when the section was dissolved. With the encouragement of John Dunkelberger, Bill Kuvlesky, and others the decision was made to give a rural sociology section of the ASAW a chance and Alleger was asked to serve as chairman.

An appeal was made to the Council of ASAW for recognition of a tentative section in rural sociology. The first meeting of the rural sociology section took place in February of 1969. The meeting was well attended and there was no difficulty in reaching the decision that the section should continue. Subsequent meetings have vouched for the vitality of the group involved and attest to the fact that it is serving a very real need. (See Appendix 4 for a list of the Rural Sociology Section officers.)

At the same time the tentative organization of the ASAW section was underway, contacts were made with the Farm Foundation to determine how much interest existed for supporting a Southern Rural Sociology Committee. The response from Joseph Ackerman of the Farm Foundation indicated a willingness to provide funds but the actual organization would have to be approved and appointed by the southern experiment station directors. The response was given substance when the next budget of the Farm Foundation included funds for a meeting which would be available when the Committee's formation was complete. A meeting was arranged for July 26, 1967 involving Joe Ackerman, Dean Smith, Paul Jehlik, Al Bertrand, Harold Kaufman, and myself to discuss the specifics of such an organization. A list of names of those who might be appointed to such a committee was drawn up, a statement of purpose was prepared, and a tentative first meeting date was set. It was decided that the committee would be known as the Southern Rural Sociology Research Committee because the directors of extension in the region were not favorable toward extension participation in such a group at that time. The first meeting of the SRSRC was held in Atlanta on February 15 and 16, 1968.

The SRSRC has continued to be an effective source of ideas about needed research in the region. One of the spin-offs was in the area of demography. When a group of the committee members went to see what resources at Oak Ridge might be used to facilitate their work, the groundwork was laid for the establishment of the Southern Regional Demographic Group which also continues to flourish. (See Appendix 5 for a list of the officers and committee structure of the SRSRC.)

Transition From Mobility to Institutional Impact

The Mobility Study was scheduled to terminate in the middle of 1971. This was preceded by a great deal of discussion as to what the nature of a revision or replacement project should be. There was a clear recognition that the then current project really was two projects in one and that such a division of interests had interfered with the effective utilization of the time available for the technical committee meetings. The decision was made to replace the single project with two projects. One of those developed (hereafter called the Institutional Impact study and known as S-79) was designed to examine the effect of major changes in the study counties on adjustment and to build on the original Adjustment Study. The second project developed dealt with the mobility of the

young people who had been interviewed in connection with the Mobility Study. Dean Smith indicated that the regional directors would probably approve a second rural sociology research project due primarily to the increase emphasis in USDA on social concerns. He suggested that the two project committees should keep in close touch because of the related nature of their concerns.

During 1970, there had been considerable discussion in the Congress about rural development and other expressions about the lot of people living in rural areas. More than fifty bills dealing with rural development were introduced in the Congress but there was some uncertainity about the funding of any of them. Eventually one was passed but the question of funding stayed up in the air until near the end of the calendar year when the budget was finally adopted. When the budget was adopted and it became apparent that some funds for rural development research would be available which had to be spent during the current fiscal year, by June 30, 1971, the call went out to identify projects which would clearly fall into the definition of rural development. There was a hasty reclassification of a large number of projects but there was also encouragement to submit projects which were already being developed.

Some kind of record for cutting red tape in getting a regional project approved must have been set with the Institutional Impact project proposal. The proposal was sent to Dean Smith on January 11, 1971, with approval for the project by the Southern Regional Research Committee, (for the southern directors), by the Committee of Nine and by CSRS, obtained as of February 1, 1971. Dean Smith of course was largely responsible for getting the approval through in such short order. The fact that the project proposal had been in the discussion stage for nearly two years also had something to do with the very ready acceptance of the proposal. It was clear that the proposal had not been hurriedly whipped up just to take advantage of recently passed appropriations. The first meeting of the technical committee occurred less than two weeks after the proposal had been accepted.

One of the problems connected with getting the Institutional Impact study underway was that the nine states that were to be involved were also involved in the Mobility Study which had not yet terminated. There was a manpower shortage at the moment. A number of the same people were involved in the SRSRC as well as the rural sociology section of the SAAS with the result that the opportunities for contact were excellent but the efforts to make real progress with the new project cut into the time and energy available for other responsibilities. In spite of these handicaps, however, preliminary work on the project was initiated before the end of the fiscal year. (See Appendix 6 for a list of the committee personnel and officers.)

The follow up study of Youth Mobility, designated as S-81, experienced some delay in getting organized while making efforts to

specify the objectives and the procedures to be followed in achieving them. With Bill Kuvlesky, John Kelly, and John Dunkelberger assuming a great deal of the leadership, a proposal was developed which was accepted for approval as of July 1, 1971. The annual meetings for the two technical committees were held in the same hotel at the same time in October of that year.

Conclusion

Southern regional research in rural sociology has made a great deal of progress in the last decade. The initial push by Harold Kaufman along with some substantial increases in the number of rural sociologists at Experiment Stations in the region and very effective support from Dean Smith have resulted in some significant achievements. There have been problems in continuity of personnel directly involved with the regional projects but a small nucleus has provided some essential stability. The lists of officers and subcommittee chairmen over the years provides some indication of just who these people were. The continuing interest and support of others not directly involved in the projects must also be recognized as important in the effectiveness of these projects. Without the support of department heads, experiment station directors and the USDA (especially CSRS), such achievements would have been extremely difficult.

APPENDIX 1

Principal professional personnel involved in the S-44 Adjustment Study:
(From S-44 Termination Report)

State or Agency	Personnel
Alabama	John E. Dunkelberger John M. Huie Ben T. Lanham, Jr. Harold L. Nix
Arkansas	William S. Folkman J. L. Charlton
Florida	Daniel E. Alleger
Georgia	John D. Kelley
Kentucky	J. J. Mangalam C. Milton Coughenour A. Lee Coleman Harry K. Schwarzweller
Louisiana	Lee Taylor J. V. D. Saunders
Mississippi	Calvin Vanlandingham Benjamin E. Haddox Harold F. Kaufman John E. Dunkelberger Leslie J. Silverman
North Carolina	Glenn C. McCann Seung Gyu Moon C. Horace Hamilton
Tennessee	Charles L. Cleland
Texas	Bardin H. Nelson William P. Kuvlesky Sherman K. Fitzgerald John R. Christiansen

State or Agency	Personnel
USDA, ERS	E. Grant Youmans Louis J. Ducoff
CSRS Representative	Paul J. Jehlik
Administrative Advisor	Dean E. V. Smith

******

S-44 Committee Meetings and Organization
(From annual reports and minutes of meetings)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting	Chairman	Vice-Chairman	Secretary
1959	April, Birmingham	Kaufman	-----	Folkman
1959	October, Memphis	Kaufman	Nelson	McCann
	Subcommittees: Sampling-Nelson Classification-McCann Schedule-Coughenour			
1960	October, Birmingham	Nelson	Kaufman	McCann
	Subcommittees: Basic Coding-Nelson First Report-Cleland			
1961	October, Atlanta	Nelson	Cleland	McCann
	Subcommittees: Environmental Data-Dunkelberger Steering-Cleland			
1962	October, Atlanta	Cleland	-----	Mangalam
1963	October, Atlanta	Cleland	Taylor	Mangalam
	Subcommittee: Project Revision-Taylor			
1964	March, Atlanta October, Atlanta	Cleland	Mangalam	Kelley

******

APPENDIX 2

Participants in Joint OEO-CSTS Seminar
(From meeting minutes taken by John Kelley)

Participants present:

Alleger, Daniel E., Florida Agricultural Experiment Station, Gainesville
Boyd, Virlyn A., South Carolina AES, Clemson
Bradley, George, Rural Community Development Service, USDA
Byerly, T. C., Administrator, Cooperative State Research Service, USDA
Cleland, Charles L., Tennessee AES, Knoxville
Cravitz, Sanford, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity
Day, Lee, Economic Research Service, USDA
Drake, Chad, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity
Dunkelberger, John E., Alabama AES, Auburn
Hausler, Richard, Director, Rural Affairs Task Force, OEO and USDA
Hill, Howard, Economic Research Service, USDA
Hijort, Howard, Staff Economist Group, USDA
Inman, Buis, Economic Research Service, USDA
Jehlik, Paul J., Cooperative State Research Service, USDA
John, M. E., Pennsylvania AES, University Park
Kelley, John D., Georgia AES, Athens
Leighday, Jim, Research Policy Planning and Evaluation, OEO
Leonard, Olen, Economic Research Service, USDA
Mangalam, J. J., Kentucky AES, Lexington
Mayo, Slez C., North Carolina AES, Raleigh
McNamara, Robert L., Missouri AES, Columbia
Moon, Seung Gyu, North Carolina AES, Raleigh
Nelson, Bardin H., Texas AES, College Station
Niederfeank, Evlon J., Federal Extension Service, USDA
Solcum, Walter L., Washington AES, Pullman
Smith, E. V., Dean, Alabama AES, Auburn
Sperry, I. V., University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Sugarman, Jule, Deputy Associate Director, Title II, Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity
Taylor, M. Lee, Louisiana AES, Baton Rouge
Vanlandingham, Calvin L., Mississippi AES, State College
Weidenheimer, Peggy, Statistical Reporting Service, USDA
White, Bennet, Cooperative State Research Service, USDA
Youmans, E. Grant, Kentucky AES, Lexington

APPENDIX 3

Principal professional personnel involved in the S-61 Mobility Study:
(From S-61 Termination Report)

State or Agency	Personnel
Alabama	John E. Dunkelberger Calvin L. Vanlandingham
Arkansas	Geraldine B. Terry
Florida	Daniel E. Alleger
Georgia	John D. Kelley Melvin Knapp
Kentucky	J. J. Mangalam A. Lee Coleman
Louisiana	Pedro F. Hernandez George Wilber
Mississippi	Elizabeth J. Stojanovic Calvin L. Vanlandingham Gerald O. Windham Arthur G. Cosby
North Carolina	Glenn C. McCann C. Horace Hamilton
South Carolina	Virlyn A. Boyd
Tennessee	Charles L. Cleland
Texas	William P. Kuvlesky W. Kennedy Upham John T. Pelham
USDA, ERS	E. Grant Youmans James H. Copp Louis J. Ducoff
CSRS Representative	Paul J. Jehlik
Administrative Advisor	Dean E. V. Smith

******

S-61 Committee Meetings and Organization
(From annual reports and minutes of meetings)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting	Chairman	Vice-Chairman	Secretary
1965	February, Atlanta October, Atlanta Subcommittees: Restudy-McCann Youth-Kuvlesky	Cleland	Dunkelberger	Kelley
1966	October, Atlanta Subcommittees: Restudy-Dunkelberger Youth-Kuvlesky	Kelley	Cleland	Kuvlesky
1967	October, New Orleans Subcommittees: Restudy-Cleland Youth-Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	Kelley	Kuvlesky
1968	October, Atlanta Subcommittees: Restudy-Cleland Youth-Hernandez	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	Boyd
1969	October, Houston Subcommittees: Restudy-Cleland Youth-Kuvlesky	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	Boyd
1970	October, New Orleans	Cleland	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger

******

APPENDIX 4

Officers of the Rural Sociology Section of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers (From the section Proceedings)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting (February)	Chairman	Chairman-elect	Secretary, Program Chairman	Secretary, Prog. Chairman elect
1968-69	Mobile	Alleger	- - - -	Kuvlesky	- - - -
1969-70	Memphis	Alleger	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	- - - -
1970-71	Jacksonville	Kuvlesky	Dunkelberger	Sollie	Voland
1971-72	Richmond	Dunkelberger	Sollie	Voland	Boyd
1972-73	Atlanta	Sollie	Voland	Boyd	Cosby

APPENDIX 5

Officers and Organization of the Southern Rural Sociology Research Committee (From meeting minutes and personal notes.)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting	Chairman	Vice-Chairman	Secretary
1968	February, Atlanta	Cleland	Tate	Skrabanek
	Subcommittees: Delineation of Development Areas-Bertrand Institutional Structure and Change-Kelley Poverty: Dimensions, Causes and Alleviation of-Sollie Demographic and Migration Patterns-Skrabanek			
1969	February, Atlanta	Cleland	Dunkelberger	Sollie
	Subcommittees: Poverty-Sollie Demographic and Migration Patterns-Skrabanek Development Areas and Institutional Structures-Knapp			
1969	November, Atlanta	Dunkelberger	Sollie	Kelley
1970	June, Knoxville	(Officers Continued)		
	Subcommittees: Poverty-Sollie Demographic-Pendelton Education-Kaufman Development-Knapp			
1971	June, Atlanta	Sollie	Kelley	Boyd
1973	- - - -	Sollie	Kelley	Boyd
	Subcommittee: Factors affecting rural sociology in the South-Kuvlesky			

******

List of SRSRC State Representatives for 1968

Alabama	Dr. John Dunkelberger
Arkansas	Dr. J. L. Charlton
Georgia	Dr. John Kelley
Florida	Prof. D. E. Alleger
Kentucky	Dr. James S. Browm
Louisiana	Dr. A. L. Bertrand
Mississippi	Dr. Carlton R. Sollie
North Carolina	Dr. Selz Mayo
Oklahoma	None
South Carolina	Dr. V. A. Boyd
Tennessee	Dr. Charles L. Cleland
Texas	Dr. R. L. Skrabanek
Virginia	Dr. Leland B. Tate
At Large	Dr. Harold Kaufman
Representing CSRS	Dr. Paul J. Jehlik
Administrative Advisor	Dean E. V. Smith

APPENDIX 6

Principal professional personnel involved in the S-79 Institutional Impact Study (From various letters and memory)

State or Agency	Personnel
Alabama	Calvin Vanlandingham Wayne Curtis
Georgia	Max Miller James Tarver
Kentucky	A. Lee Coleman C. Milton Coughenour James Brown
Louisiana	Pedro Hernandez Virginia Steelman
Mississippi	Gerald Windham
North Carolina	Glenn C. McCann
South Carolina	Edward McLean
Tennessee	Charles L. Cleland Ying Nan Lin
Texas	W. Kennedy Upham
CSRS Representatives	Kenneth Wilkinson Harold Capener
Administrative Advisors	Dean E. V. Smith Jarvis Miller

******

S-79 Committee Meetings and Organization
(From meeting minutes and personal notes.)

Year	Month & Place of Meeting	Chairman	Vice-Chairman	Secretary
1971	February, Atlanta	Cleland	McCann	Windham
	Subcommittees: Knowledgeables Survey-Miller Household Interviews-McCann Secondary Data Needs-Vanlandingham			
1971	October, Atlanta	Cleland	McCann	Miller
	Subcommittees: Census Data-Upham Other Secondary Data-Vanlandingham Knowledgeables Interviews-Coleman Household Interviews-McCann			
1972	June, Atlanta	McCann	Coleman	Miller

Section III

F U T U R E

THE FUTURE FOR RURAL SOCIOLOGY IN THE SOUTH

William P. Kuvlesky*

Rural sociology in the South had until recent times been represented by a small number of thinly dispersed Experiment Station scientists. Notable exceptions to this general state of affairs existed only in a few states--Louisiana, Mississippi, and Georgia--and, even in these cases support for academic instruction and programs in rural sociology was not particularly evident. During the sixties and early seventies there has been a dramatic increase of Experiment Station staff in rural sociology in the South; however, the number of scientific man years involved still remains small in the total region and too small in most states to concentrate a critical breadth and mass of talent. Graduate training in rural sociology is still meager within the region, which means that most positions requiring rural sociologists have to be filled with Ph.D.'s trained outside the South.

Others have written more fully about the past and present in this volume, but what about the future of rural sociology in the South? This is the question I wish to address. The task presents a dilemma--should I was prophetic trying to provide an accurate prognosis of future events, or should I sketch a possibility that to me seems attractive and realizable. Perhaps, I shall do some of both in the few paragraphs to follow. My objectives are to briefly outline the potential for development of rural sociology in the southern region of the U.S. and then to discuss ways I think that potential can be realized. This will call for honestly facing-up to several critical problems I perceive confronting the discipline and, also, focusing on several opportunities that I think will provide specific potentials for growth and development.

The Future

For a number of years many people in and out of rural sociology have been pessimistic about the future of the discipline. With the transfer of political power from rural to metropolitan publics, it was easy to

---

*Professor of Sociology, Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Texas A&M University and Research Sociologist, Prairie View A&M University.

reason that anything having to do with "rural" or "agriculture" and dependent on public support would surely fare badly. I never counted myself as one of these people, for it appeared to me that some of our strongest faculties in rural sociology--at Penn State, Cornell, and Michigan State--were in some of the country's most urbanized and highly industrialized states. The recent blossoming of rural sociology at Texas A&M over the past decade fits the same pattern. For some time I have maintained that rural sociology as a discipline may eventually become concentrated in a single faculty located at one major Land-Grant University in each region of the country. Strong associations will exist between these major centers of rural sociology and smaller two or three man satellite units located at other institutions, and with other rural sociologists scattered around in land-grant colleges, in metropolitan schools, or in public agencies located throughout the region. I see no compelling evidence to challenge this vision; however, in the south we may find several major centers evolving instead of a single one as will probably be the case elsewhere.

The South as a region has many more rural dwellers, as compared with urban, than any other region of the United States. It probably has a majority of all rural poor families in the U.S., and it is on the threshold of a dramatic movement out of a tradition-bound, agrarian past into a fast accelerating process of urbanization and industrialization. The region has all the attributes for explosive growth and development--land, water, climate, and people with pride and commitment in their areas of residence. The South also has unique problems nested in its own cultural history, including the touchy but serious problem of building new forms of association and new relationships between the two racial groupings making up most of its population. Forty percent of the rural population in this country is subject to the stresses, strains and opportunities presented as consequences of this multifaceted, fast flowing change in the South. This is where the action is and will be for rural sociology--in the South.

The need for expanding research and instruction in rural sociology to face up to the many long ignored "people problems" facing rural and agricultural development is becoming observable to many Southern Agricultural Experiment Station Directors. A meeting I attended with Charles Cleland in Atlanta this past fall, where rural sociology was discussed with the Southern Directors, was evidence in and of itself of, at least, growing interest and concern about the discipline on their part. The recent expansion of rural sociology at such places as Auburn, Clemson, LSU, Georgia, and Texas A&M is a harbinger of even greater growth in the future--at these schools and others. Moreover, the continued rapid dispersement of trained rural sociologists into non-land-grant colleges and universities across the region is another aspect of development that in the long-run might be even more significant, particularly relative to recruitment of enthusiastic, young people into the discipline and in finding ways to broaden the often narrowly confined basis of support for the discipline.

A recent survey made by a Committee of the Southern Rural Sociology Research Committee indicated there are more than 150 sociologists in the South who either call themselves rural sociologists or who indicate that it is one of their predominate interests. This survey also indicated that over 200 other types of social scientists--including many Agricultural Economists--desire to work with rural sociologists. The picture presented of the current status of rural sociology in the south is pleasantly startling; yet, it seems reasonable to expect that these figures will double by the end of this decade. This is possible, but only if rural sociologists face up honestly to some important weaknesses of the discipline in this region. Some of the major problems are: the lack of effective organization and leadership; too many scientists who have not achieved high levels of productivity and have not become visible in the larger discipline of sociology; lack of communications with important external publics, including Experiment Station Directors; lack of degree programs and broad instruction in rural sociology among most institutions in the region; a cautious, conservative tendency to research again and again the same, safe problems and a lack of imagination in striking out to break new ground; and the general negative bias existing toward employment opportunities in the South among sociologists in other regions, which often makes adequate staffing a serious problem.

Resolution of some of these problems is already in sight. The apparent development of a strong, broad organizational base for rural sociology section of the Southern Association of Agricultural Scientists. In addition, the formation of a special group to explore potentials for expansion of cooperative efforts among rural sociologists in the region by the Southern Rural Sociology Research Committee has produced information that can be used to facilitate development of other forms of association. The increasing involvement of the "1890 schools" in rural sociological research and the participation of staff located at these schools in regional meetings and in collaborative efforts with other rural sociologists is a promising development as well. Out of these encouraging beginnings should come the organizational network and leadership potential to open up the great potential that exists in the southern region for sociology.

In research and instruction, several concentrations of faculty expertise exist which can evolve into a major regional center for rural sociology in the South--LSU, Georgia, Texas A&M, and Mississippi State. In addition, two very strong Extension staffs have evolved--North Carolina State and Texas A&M--and a third, at the University of Florida, seems to be in the making: any of these could evolve into one of the strongest Extension rural sociology groups in the U.S., given dynamic leadership and strong support within their state. We need at least one major center for graduate training in rural sociology in the southern region. Where will it be? At least four universities already mentioned have the potential to develop strong graduate programs.

Many Agricultural Experiment Stations in the South are moving toward a "task force" mode of organization for problem oriented research--Mississippi is a good example in this regard. Such a tendency will undoubtedly increase across the South in the future. Rural sociologists should orient themselves toward this development as a good opportunity for staff expansion and growth. Good arguments could and should be made that these task forces include both research and extension expertise in rural sociology, if they are to meliorate the pressing regional problems of today and tommorrow--conservation of resources and management of the ways in which they are used; monitoring and controlling social changes to meliorate social conflicts; development of communities and areas to control stagnation and deterioration of neighboring regions; maximization of agricultural operations to ensure realization of the good life for farmers and their associates; and providing a better understanding of intergroup relations and orientations so that social justice and opportunities are available to all in equal measure.

The Challenge

I conclude that the future for rural sociology in the South is very bright. The potential for development of our discipline in the service of mankind and our region is open. We have a large debt to pay to the relatively few courageous rural sociologists of the past for preparing the base in which this growth can be rooted--and to a few good men with vision outside the discipline as well. But, the extent to which we can realize the potentials that exist will depend to a large extent on the success we have <u>today</u> in recruiting and developing the capabilities of bright young scholars, researchers, and educators in rural sociology. Personally, I see this kind of men and women joining our rands already and I can see no reason why the trend should not continue. Within a decade rural sociologists in the South will be a dominant force in the region and, I believe, in the nation relative to policy making and social action strategies involving the hinterland and rural-urban relations. The South represents increasingly, the place of "action" in rural sociology.